DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 798 FL 006 071

AUTHOR Shuy, Roger
TITLE Sociolinguistics and Education: Promise and Problems in the Seventies.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at The World Congress of Sociology (8th, Toronto, Ontario, August 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; Educational Improvement; *Educational Innovation; Educational Practice; Educational Problems; Educational Theories; Language Skills; Language Styles; Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

The assumptions of sociolinguistics are contrasted with those of its more static predecessors in light of their potential for bearing on educational problems. The focus on variability with regard to sex, age, style, socioeconomic status, race, education is more akin to the dynamics of the linguistic and educational setting in which a child finds himself than structural or generative grammar were. This focus on variability gets to the heart of many school problems involving writing, reading, and talking. It bears on perplexing questions about how to delimit styles, how to effect acceptability in the language of others, how people set themselves off from each other through language, and how subtle variation between spoken and written language forms can cause problems in composition or reading. In the past, native language teaching has had to deal with these issues, but it has never before had the tools to do so. Sociolinguistic information can be used to rethink the education of teachers and the development of realistic instructional materials and techniques. Yet the effort is likely to be stymied unless careful attention is given to the lack of credibility of linguistics which past crimes have fostered, to the dynamics of educational change, and to developing less hostile attitudes toward education among sociolinguists. (Author)

ED 090798

Sociolinguistics and Education:

Promise and Problems in The Seventies

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roger W. Shuy

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL 006 071

Roger W. Shuy
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C.

Eighth World Congress of Sociology
Toronto, August 1974

ABSTRACT

Sociolinguistics and Education:
Promise and Problems in The Seventies

This paper contrasts the assumptions of sociolinguistics with those of its more static predecessors in light of their potential for bearing on educational problems. The focus on variability with regard to sex, age, style, socioeconomic status, race, education is more akin to the dynamics of the linguistic and educational setting in which a child finds himself than structural or generative grammar were. This focus on variability gets to the heart of many school problems involving writing, reading and talking. It bears on perplexing questions about how to delimit styles, how to effect acceptability in the language of others, how people set themselves off from each other through language, and how subtle variation between spoken and written language forms can cause problems in composition or reading. In the past, native language teaching has had to deal with these issues, but it has never before had the tools to do so.

Sociolinguistic information can be used to rethink the education of teachers and the development of realistic instructional materials and techniques. Yet the effort is likely to be stymied unless careful attention is given to the lack of credibility of linguistics which past crimes have fostered, to the dynamics of educational change and to developing less hostile attitudes toward education among sociolinguists.

Sociolinguistics and Education:

Promise and Problems in The Seventies

Two of the most difficult problems for the schools to deal with, as far as language is concerned, are deeply ingrained in the assumptions of educational theory and practice. Both problems are patently obvious to those who recognize them but amazingly elusive to teachers. It is difficult, if not cruel, to say that certain fields have inherent blind spots but this appears to be the case with respect to education. These assumptions are:

1. That if two different systems exist in a culture, one is necessarily derivative of the other or inferior to it.
2. That there are no degrees of rightness or wrongness and that all student answers are either clearly one or the other.

Much of what linguists have been trying to say to educators in the past has falled on deaf ears partly because of the linguists' failure to understand the depth and complexity of these beginning assumptions. Like the educators themselves, we have assumed that because we tell them something, they have learned it. Even more heinous, we have assumed that because we have managed to get them to repeat our wisdom back to us, that they understand what they are saying when they say it.

Linguists have made at best only small inroads toward the remediation of these two beginning assumptions. Part of the reason for our lack of progress has been that the field simply had little to say about either issue. However long the concept of cultural relativity has existed, we have come close to universal failure in communicating it to educators. Perhaps it was because they were so busy building their own apology that they failed to diagnose the crucial underlying attitude accurately. The second assumption, involving the right-wrong polarity, was long ignored in linguistics and, therefore, expectation of influence from linguistics to education might be predicted only in the past few years.

It is the thesis of this paper that the assumptions and practices of sociolinguistics have a greater potential for bearing on these and other educational problems than did any of its theoretical predecessors or competitors. The current interest in discovering sociolinguistic systems and subsystems has led

us to useful metaphors to utilize in speaking with educators. We can now talk about social dialect systems of equality and appropriateness, a topic which can be made to be real and reasonable to school teachers, rather than using the old cross-language metaphors (e.g. French is as good as Swedish). We are beginning to be able to convince some teachers, at least, that a child develops a set of linguistic repertoires to use in coping with life and that one is not necessarily always superior to another (e.g. it may actually be inappropriate to play football in standard English). If such progress continues, the entire panoply of variability (sex, age, style, status, race, education, etc.) may be opened for healthy examination and application in the schools.

The right-wrong polarity system is a school problem which is also opening up. A sense of continuum, only vaguely comprehended in the earlier stages of social dialectology, is now beginning to surface in sociolinguistics. The relationship of language variation to creolization is emerging as a crucial issue of our time and the development of new ways of analyzing language variability is a new concept in the field. Static grammars of any kind, descriptive or generative, are being seen as inadequate and the reality and power of social dialectology seems to be growing. The usual school correct- or incorrect-polarity attitude toward error-making is seldom valued in the schools, and teachers seem to feel that they must always correct any errors that their children may make. This is incredibly short sighted, since not all errors are alike and many evidence more creativity and cognitive ability than the presumed correct ones. My son evidenced such creativity once when asked where Australia got its name. He pondered a minute, reflecting that the country was settled by prisoners who were ostracized by the British, and explained that the name, Australia, was derived from the word ostracized. It was a creative answer which just happened to be wrong. The classic example of a virtuous error is the widely-told story of the physics student who, when asked how to measure the height of a building using a barometer, replied that he would go to the owner of the building and say, "If you'll tell me how tall your building is, I'll give you a barometer". Children experiment with language in much the same way. They try new combinations, they hypercorrect, they regularize irregular verbs and many other creative and highly cognitive schemes. Perhaps the schools would do well to recognize different types of

errors for what they frequently are--evidence of high intelligence. It is easy to see how the study of sociolinguistics, with its focus on the whole range of potential language variation and its functional bases for establishing appropriate form-selection, would have more to say about this problem than static linguistics has historically offered. Such variation is at the very heart of our discipline and the applications are numerous and significant. But this was not always the case. About a decade ago, certain linguists first began to see the study of social dialect as a potentially fruitful area for improving the condition of Black children in ghettoes. Something needed to be done and it appeared that other disciplines were handicapped in a number of ways from being of immediate usefulness. Educational theory, with its focus on abstract models and techniques, seemed to lack a physical content or subject matter in which to actualize itself. Psychology, with its stress on invisible or semi-visible entities such as attitudes and motivations, also seemed to need a physical locus as a peg on which to hang its hat. Linguistics, with its stress on invariant rules and abstract deep structure, had wandered far from real language use in real life contexts. Perhaps it is characteristic of all disciplines that beginnings are found in the real conflicts of life but that development involves the processes of abstraction, theory and supra-real generalization. This is probably as it ought to be. For linguistics, at least, the heavy emphasis brought by Noam Chomsky and his followers was on the abstract, the universal and the theoretical. And, linguistics needed the respectability of theory if it was to survive as an academic field. In fact, over a decade later, it now seems clearly evident that such a focus may have saved linguistics as an academic field. But such changes almost always bring over-reactions and over-indulgences. In a concentrated effort to find universals, one tends to ignore particulars. In an effort to find underlying rules, one tends to overlook interesting patterns on the surface. In an effort to state the importance of a solid theory, one tends to say that anything else is trivial.

In linguistics, the one-sided dominance of such an approach began to crumble when it became clear that the more we learned about the universals of language, the less likely it was that a grammar could ever be written. Speculative arguments over the best ways of deriving surface features from

deep structure began to take on the appearance of academic game-playing. Nothing was verifiable (except through rationality) and variability was swept under the rug and called uninteresting. Annual meetings of The Linguistic Society of America gradually turned from their formerly broad concern for language in its psychological, historical, social, educational, geographical, physiological and theoretical states to language (grammar, in particular) as theory almost exclusively. A drift of members developed from which the organization is only now beginning to recover. Anthropological linguists, psycholinguists, applied linguists and even historical linguists began to drop-out and to give their papers at more congenial and specialized meetings.

Two things began to bring about a change in this state of affairs. One was the general broadening of interests which began to develop in the sixties, leading to new kinds of interdisciplinary studies. The second was the development of interest in problems faced by minority peoples, especially in the schools. Linguists began to take an interest in urban language and to understand that past methodologies were no longer viable. New data-gathering techniques were required and new modes of analysis were needed. Meanwhile, linguists who had been interested in language variation as it is found in the creolization and pidginization of language also began to apply their knowledge to urban social dialect, particularly the urban, northern, Black, often providing important historical backgrounds for language change and offering analytical insights brought about by their perspectives. The general focus, of course, was on variability, not on abstract uniformity and the critical measurement point was provided by the variability offered by Vernacular Black English. It was thought of as an area of educational attention. It was thought to be an interesting source of study by psychologists (behavioral psychologists thought the language embodies attitudes and cognitive psychologists thought it inferred them).

As is so often the case, the problem born in the classroom took several years to find nourishment from the disciplines which could help feed it (psychology, anthropology, linguistics, sociology). And, until proper attention could be given, it developed several dangerous symptoms caused by an improper diet of home-made nourishments. Yet, the research that was attempted was met with attack on almost every hand. Educators got to the problem first, offering

suggestions for changing the speech of Black children to match classroom norms.[1] Later, this approach was to be criticized as wiping out the child's culture. Equally serious was the attack by linguists that teachers had not analyzed the language accurately (if at all) and had stressed the teaching of insignificant features rather than crucial ones. It took a year or two, but the analysis of Vernacular Black English was gradually carried out, making use of Black scholars whenever possible, but usually by whites alone. These studies have also been subjected to attack, frequently by Black scholars who can see errors in the analysis or who object to the fact that they were done, in the main, by whites. Their attack frequently asserts that whites can never know how Black English really works; that this is just another case of whites trying to belittle or hold back Blacks by calling attention to weakness rather than strength, that not all Blacks talk that way or that the white analysts have improper or self-serving motives for studying (exploiting) Blacks. Conservative school people have attacked such studies as permissive and generally contributing to the "anything goes" philosophy which presumably characterizes linguists anyway. Lastly, linguists have attacked each other's analysis for various reasons (quite predictably in a field which fosters such behavior).

Historically speaking, it is reasonably safe to observe that linguistics has had, at best, only a minor influence on native language education in the United States. Some language arts programs are beginning to stress linguistic pluralism and to place proper value on language variation, but much, if not most, of the focus of the linguist in American education in the past has been negative. That is, he has chosen to address himself to what is wrong with the system as it is rather than to involve himself in the question of what constructive contribution he can make to the field. The structural linguists' attack on traditional grammar in the fifties was largely a description of what was wrong with the way traditional teachers had been teaching about language. Linguists laughed at the atrocities of the stereotyped, old-fashioned, prescriptive school teacher and, however clear and accurate such criticisms were, they most certainly could not be considered tactful.

The advent of generative grammar in no way improved the interrelationship of linguistics and educational concerns. Almost before the structuralists had

rallied themselves together to produce an alternative strategy for the application of linguistics to school problems, the revolution from within linguistics began to discredit any potential application. Generative grammarians tended to focus their potential usefulness on language universals, deep and surface structure relationships and rules which generally characterized the innateness of native language. No one can doubt the usefulness of such study to linguists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and philosophers, but one might seriously question the usefulness of such information to elementary and secondary school children. To put it another way, one might seriously ask what good it will do a child to learn how to verbalize about what he has already learned how to do. The general concerns of the teacher are to help children learn to write, read and speak better. The teacher might seriously question how information which explains extant competence might contribute answers to these problems. Naturally, a teacher might be expected to know these things, for it is her responsibility to know many things related to how a child has acquired his language, how language problems can be accurately diagnosed as well as the theoretical underpinnings of language production, but there is little reason to expect children to improve their writing, reading or speaking by studying how it is they know what they already know. It may contribute to their general knowledge of the universe but it is unlikely to have the immediate impact expected by the schoolroom.

With the relatively recent developments in sociolinguistics we have come a bit closer to the sorts of problems which also concern the schools. Because of its focus on variability, sociolinguistics makes a better match with the setting in which a child can be found than its recent predecessors did. Most children are surrounded by people who speak with variation which stems from differences in social status, geography, sex, age and style. They are faced with conflicting pressures to conform to the norms of their peers, their parents, their school and their region. Often they are placed in conflict with the language and culture of textbooks and instructional strategies and the mismatch between their lifestyles and those of the educational process may be too great for them to overcome. They may be placed in further conflict by developments of minority awareness which may militate against school or majority norms in a way in which they may become politically involved to their own disadvantage. The application of such

developments appears to be, once again, promising evidence of the applicability of linguistics to educational problems, and an enthusiasm and optimism much like that of the early days of structural and generative grammar is once again upon us.

Talking

Before the recent research on Vernacular Black English began, language variation was scarcely considered as a topic in the teaching of oral language in the classroom. Pre-school language programs followed a deficit model. The following descriptive brochure is illustrative:

> In order for children to achieve in school, they must learn the language used in school... the role of the teacher of young children in fostering the development of good language skills is especially important. He must realize that language competence is a necessary first step in intellectual development. As a child learns more language, he progresses in his ability to think symbolically and abstractly. Without sufficient language development the child's conceptual development will be inhibited.[2]

Frequently it was claimed that inadequate language meant the absence of accepted school language and the first step toward learning required the acquisition of school English. To be sure, the battle with this position has not yet been won, but the advent of the study of Vernacular Black English contributes greatly to its eventual demise. The whole foundation of compensatory education might have been challenged by attacks from sources other than language, but there can be little doubt about the effectiveness of the charges of linguists in this issue. Perhaps most effective has been the writings of William Labov,[3] Joan Baratz[4] and Courtney Cazden[5] on this matter. The field of early childhood education has been rocked to its very core by charges against the logic of standard English as opposed to the illogic of non-standards of all varieties and it has now been clearly proved that logical propositions may be adequately stated in vernacular as effectively as in standard English. The latter, in fact, may well help obfuscate logical expression.

Beyond the pre-school level, continued discussion has been carried on concerning the question of how to deal with the many legitimate varieties of the English language. One early position was to eradicate them. Next it was sug-

gested that we try to develop a kind of bidialectalism. Then it was said that bidialectalism was also racist and that what was really needed was to change the attitudes of the majority to accept linguistic and cultural pluralism. Programs for the schools have been developed for eradication--assimilation theory[6] and for the bidialectal approach[7] but nothing, to my knowledge, for the latter.

In general, although it is still not clear exactly what the schools can or should do about the speech of the students, it is fairly obvious that the study of social dialects has provided a positive thrust to the discussion. One serious question, still unanswered, involves whether or not children can even be taught to add to their speech repertoires or to wipe out their vernacular speech.[8] (This does not mean that they can't learn it; only that they can't be taught it.) Indirectly, however, it seems that the schools are benefitting from the issue. Social dialect has provided a physical, observable focus for an issue which might otherwise be too abstract to be observed. It has been difficult, for example, to identify aspects of Black culture which are agreed upon by authorities and are clearly distinguishable from non-Black culture.[9] Since Vernacular Black English has both qualitative and quantitative differences from other varieties,[10] it provides a more physical focus. With such a focus, many questions of group identity, cultural pluralism and style can be clearly addressed in the classroom. The subject of Vernacular Black English is at least known to the general public and, although methodologies, materials and philosophical underpinnings are far from settled, the question of language variation is clearly on the docket for eventual consideration.

Reading

If the relationship between the study of vernacular English and the teaching of oral language has proved controversial, the relationship to the field of reading has been even more so. At the moment, at least five hypotheses have been posited as methods for reducing the mismatch between the Vernacular Black English used by some first grade children and the middle class language in which their initial reading materials are written.[11]

1. Teach children to speak standard English, then teach them to read it.
2. Teach teachers about Vernacular Black English so that they will not confuse its use with real reading problems.

3. Develop beginning materials in Vernacular Black English.
4. Develop beginning reading materials which systematically avoid the mismatch of Vernacular Black English to standard English written materials.
5. Make use of the Language Experience Approach.

To date, there has been little reason to support any one of these approaches individually. Research has been hampered by inordinate negative, public reaction to any attempts to implement number 3. Number 1, the standard, historical approach, has never been proved to be supportable. Some progress is being made on number 2 but the road has been, and will continue to be, slow and rocky. Number 4 has been implemented in only the most indirect fashion to date. Number 5 has been restricted by the average teacher's difficulty in writing down exactly what a child says rather than what she thinks he says or what she might wish he had said.

Regardless of the apparent inconclusiveness of the above hypotheses, the study of Vernacular Black English has contributed certain benefits to the field of reading. The call of linguists for more realistic and believable language in beginning reading materials has helped remove some of the stilted language of past primers. The focus of those who study Vernacular Black English on syntax and the importance of processing whole language units rather than mere letter-sound correspondences has helped modify somewhat current reading instruction along those lines. The linguist's contention that surface-structure oral reading does not necessarily reflect deep-structure comprehension is helping to play down supposed misreadings such as She go for She goes by speakers of Vernacular Black English. Some progress is being made in helping teachers learn that learning to read and learning to speak standard English are not the same thing and that an attempt to teach and evaluate both at the same time is a confusion of tasks for the teacher and child alike.

Writing

Several years ago a large Midwestern university instituted a special "relaxed admission" program especially geared to inner-city Black students. Paradoxically, the students were flunked out of the program in one year by the freshman English program. An examination of the papers of a sample of these students

revealed that 42% of the "errors" marked by the instructors were directly attributable to interference of Vernacular Black English phonology on the students' spelling or Vernacular Black English grammar on their sentence structure. To be sure, these students also had the more typical freshman composition problems (failure of pronoun to agree with antecedent, run-on sentences, sentence fragments, etc.), but they had the additional handicap of all the features which are often used to describe their home dialect. To this day, no commercially published materials exist which address the question of the special kind of interference noted above. One commercial publisher rejected a proposal to produce such materials on the grounds that the potential buying public would be too small. Another rejected the idea because it did not want to risk negative public reaction from the Black or the white general public. Under sponsorship of the USOE, such materials are currently under development at the Central Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory in St. Louis.[12] This project grew directly out of the past research on Vernacular Black English and, barring negative public reaction of the sort that has plagued the development of reading materials, it promises to add significantly to the teaching of composition in the classroom.

Evaluation

The study of language variation is also at least partially responsible for the recent flurry of concern about fairness in the practice of standardized testing in this country. To be sure, the situation was brought to a head by miscarriages of justice brought about by the current search for the educational holy grail of accountability. Examination of extant standardized tests in English and reading has clearly demonstrated cultural and linguistic bias favoring the middle class student.[13] The major point to be made here is that it is unlikely that exact pinpointing of mismatch between child language and test language would have been called to our attention without the flurry of research on variation of the past decade. The broader implication of this research, however, is that it has lead to a number of other insights into the nature of the use of language in standardized testing. As linguists examined such tests for potential mismatches they also observed areas of general weakness which went beyond Black English concerns.

It was discovered, for example, that by changing mongrel to cur in one question in one reading test, the scores of West Virginia white children could be increased by as much as three months on the scale of reading-age.[14] Areas of general linguistic and contextual ambiguity not related to Black English were pointed out by Whiteman[15] and Sullivan[16] in their studies of The California English and The Iowa Test of Basic Skills, respectively. To be sure, specialists in reading tests have also been questioning the misuse of such instruments by the schools but it cannot be denied that the study of variability has also played a role in the current re-examination of excesses in this field.

To this point, the general plea of this paper has been that despite the criticisms by people who represent those who no longer wish to be researched, by those who feel that researchers have exacerbated racial tensions by calling attention to a situation that should have been inadequate or malicious, by linguists who disagree with each other's research findings or approaches or by those who see still other faults in what has gone on in the past decade of the study of the Vernacular English used by Blacks, certain advances have been made because of it. It is difficult to remember what was being said even five years ago, much less ten. But those who were active in the field at those times may well remember the general sense of inferiority about this language system which was evidenced by scholars and laymen alike at that time.

The tendency in the schools was either to ignore the situation or attribute it to genetic inferiority, individual ignorance or willful stupidity. In general, today's situation is not quite that unenlightened. Equally interesting is that this wedge in the crack has begun to open the door toward the solution of a number of broader educational problems which have to do with linguistic and cultural variability in a much larger context than that suggested by the vernacular English used by Blacks. The discovery that Blacks have a wide repertoire of language uses is finally beginning to be seen for what it is--a distinct linguistic advantage. Ignoring for a moment the politics of education which might argue for eradicating or modifying one or more styles or for building new ones, the simple fact of the existence of such a range of styles is beginning to look like a good and useful thing. The binary, right-wrong classroom paradigm is subject to question. People do use language in a number of different contexts, for a number of pur-

poses, to a number of different people. Variation in language can be seen to be the fantastically complex tool with which degrees of subtlety can be effected, tone can be manipulated and poetry can be produced. A few years ago we seemed to have wanted everyone to talk and write alike. Today even the most pessimistic observer will have to admit that the scene is gradually changing. The study of Vernacular Black English helped bring about this slowly evolving change and, even though we are only into the early stages of it, we might not even be this far unless such studies had been made.

To this point, we have addressed ourselves to the ways in which sociolinguistics can offer concrete relevance to education. It would be foolish, however, to claim that because sociolinguistics is closer to school problems in concept, research and potential that the wedding will take place. Occasionally the educational system will look to "outsiders" for advice but to assume implementation of that advice one must become, as it were, part of the establishment. The ineffectiveness of the major critics of education who advocate its complete overthrow displays a sharp contrast to the power exerted in the area of consumer rights by Ralph Nader, whose strategy has been to work more or less from within the system. The strategy being suggested here may not be as dramatic as the one generally used by Nader, for there is considerably less public dissatisfaction about quality education than there is about faulty manufacturing; but it is closer to his approach than to out and out revolution.

The history of innovation tells us that in order for such change to be absorbed by the system a certain temper for innovation must exist. It is by no means clear that sociolinguistics is perceived by educators as the answer to their problems. Other factors which militate against such a temper stem from past arrogance and over-promise of other types of linguistics for the schools, the compelling sense of self-preservation witnessed in university education departments and the general stereotype of the nature of education as held by the public at large. That is, the establishment is not predisposed to change, the public does not really understand the problem and our past track record has not been enviable. These are certainly not conditions under which revolutionary change can thrive. Instead we will need to be more subtle in our effort to establish the temper for sociolinguistic innovations in the schools.

If the preceding analysis is accurate, the tactic for establishing a temper for innovation must be carefully and solidly built. Sociolinguists who are concerned about education must go to education rather than to let education come to them. But not only must they go to education, they must also become accepted by education. This observation is not a popular one among linguists who hold education in particular scorn. To be sure, education has displayed many weaknesses and produced many failures. It is a popular thing to scorn fields which deal with practical rather than abstract matters, particularly in the academic world where the value system seems directly proportionate to abstract impracticality. But the simple truth of the matter is that the field of education also has its value systems, its establishment and its pecking order. An outsider may be treated with dignity, even heeded, but the ultimate success of his suggestion will depend on political factors in education, just as it does in any other field of study.

One obvious strategy for establishing political power for sociolinguistic principles in education is for sociolinguists to become accepted by the educationists as functioning members of their establishment. A sociolinguist on a commission which deals with requirements for teacher certification is in a strategic position to suggest that language courses become central to the training of reading and language arts teachers. A sociolinguist on the evaluation panel of early childhood education programs being developed by educational laboratories and research and development centers is in a strategic position to effect changes in the staffing and focus of such projects. A sociolinguist in the administration of a city school system is in a strategic position for implementing changes suggested by his field in the humanizing of native language instruction. Not all sociolinguists, of course, will be able or willing to accept such roles, even as a supplementary aspect of their primary activities in sociolinguistics. But if we are to gain power within the field of education, it is likely that some of us will need to be so motivated. Such a strategy will involve our going to education with our ideas, presenting these ideas from the viewpoint of education rather than linguistics, expressing these ideas in terms and concepts which will be likely to be understood and valued, by developing tolerance for the ignorance and naivete of educators about our field and by admitting our own ignorance and naivete about certain understandings and skills held by educators.

It should be made clear at this point that certain dangers will accrue to those sociolinguists who agree to carry the good news to education. There is no assurance, for example, that they will be able to preserve their status among linguists who value only the abstract and despise the practical. Nor is there any assurance that the time and effort involved in such work will not impede their own sociolinguistic research projects. Values must always be seen in relationship to other values and one always lives within a framework of impositions.

The dynamics of educational change are little understood, even by educators, much less by sociolinguists, but it is apparent that it will take some knowledge of these dynamics for the field to fulfill its promise in The Seventies. But the opportunity is golden and the time is ripe.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See, for example, Ruth Golden, Instructional record for changing regional speech patterns, Folkways/Scholastic, No. 9323, 1965.

[2] Theodore W. Parsons, Teaching young children, Stanford: Professional Development Systems, n. d.

[3] William Labov, The logic of non-standard English in J. Alatis (ed.), Georgetown Monograph Series, No. 22, 1969.

[4] Joan Baratz, Teaching reading in an urban Negro school in F. Williams (ed.), Language and poverty, Chicago: Markham, 1970.

[5] Courtney Cazden, Approaches to social dialects in early childhood education in R. Shuy (compiler) Social dialects and interdisciplinary perspectives, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1971.

[6] Almost all traditional English or language arts programs.

[7] Several bidialectal approaches exist. The best is Irwin Feigenbaum, English now, New York: New Century, 1971.

[8] This does not mean that they cannot learn it; only that they cannot be taught it.

[9] Even in the work of quite systematic and respectable scholars such as Roger Abrahams, it is difficult to pin-point exactly at what points on a white to non-white continuum the concept of black culture can be plotted. See, for example, Abrahams' A true and exact way of talking black, MS, presented at the Conference on the Ethnography of Speaking, Austin, Texas, 1972.

[10] This is a point frequently overlooked by laymen and scholars alike. Quantitative differences refer to differences in the frequency of occurrence of a given feature in the speech of an individual. Qualitative differences are observed when a given feature approximates total presence of absence in the speech of an individual. Quantitative differences are said to be variable. Qualitative differences are categorical.

[11] See R. Shuy, Speech differences and teaching strategies: how different is enough? in R. Hodges and E. Rudorf (eds.), Language and learning to read: what teachers should know about language, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

[12] Under the direction of Barbara Long work on this project began while Mrs. Long was at the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory (now defunct) in Minneapolis. After that lab went out of business, Mrs. Long's project was taken under the supervision of CMREL in St. Louis. Similar work is cur-

rently underway at the University of Michigan by Professors Jay Robinson and Richard Bailey and at Georgetown University by Mrs. Marcia Whiteman.

[13] Jennifer G. Sullivan, A sociolinguistic review of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and Marcia Whiteman, Dialect differences in testing the language of children: a review of the California Language Tests in D. Smith and W. Riley (eds.), Georgetown Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 5 (Sociolinguistics), 1971, pages 61-75 and 48-60.

[14] John Connolly, The Iowa Test of Basic Skills in a rural West Virginia community, paper presented at A. E. R. A., 1969 (Los Angeles).

[15] Idem.

[16] Idem.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, Roger. 1972. A true and exact way of talking Black. Paper presented at the Conference on the Ethnography of Speaking (Austin, Texas).

Baratz, Joan. 1970. Teaching reading in an urban Negro school. In Frederick Williams (ed.), Language and poverty. Chicago: Markham.

Cazden, Courtney. 1971. Approaches to dialects in early childhood education. In R. Shuy (compiler), Social dialects and interdisciplinary perspectives. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Connolly, John. 1969. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills in a rural West Virginia community. Paper presented at A.E.R.A. (Los Angeles).

Feigenbaum, Irwin. 1971. English now. New York: New Century.

Golden, Ruth. 1965. Instructional record for changing regional speech patterns. Folkways/Scholastic, No. 9323.

Labov, William. 1969. The logic of non-standard English. In J. Alatis (ed.), Georgetown Round Table Monograph Series, No. 22. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Parsons, Theodore W. n.d. Teaching young children. Stanford: Professional Development Systems.

Shuy, Roger W. 1972. Speech differences and teaching strategies: how different is enough?. In R. Hodges and E. Rudorf (eds.), Language and learning to read: what teachers should know about language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sullivan, Jennifer G. 1971. A sociolinguistic review of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. In D. Smith and W. Riley (eds.), Georgetown Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 5 (Sociolinguistics). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pages 61-75.

Whiteman, Marcia. 1971. Dialect differences in testing the language of children: a review of the California Language Tests. In D. Smith and W. Riley (eds.), Georgetown Working Papers in Linguistics, No. 5 (Sociolinguistics). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, pages 48-60.